arXiv:1410.7083v3 [math.FA] 24 Aug 2016

Variational principles for self-adjoint operator functions arising from second-order systems

Birgit Jacob[*] Matthias Langer[†] Carsten Trunk[‡]

Abstract

Variational principles are proved for self-adjoint operator functions arising from variational evolution equations of the form

$$\langle \ddot{z}(t), y\rangle + \mathfrak{d}[\dot{z}(t), y] + \mathfrak{a}_0[z(t), y] = 0.$$

Here $\mathfrak{a}_0$ and $\mathfrak{d}$ are densely defined, symmetric and positive sesquilinear forms on a Hilbert space H. We associate with the variational evolution equation an equivalent Cauchy problem corresponding to a block operator matrix $\mathscr{A}$, the forms

$$\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x,y] := \lambda^2\langle x,y\rangle + \lambda\,\mathfrak{d}[x,y] + \mathfrak{a}_0[x,y],$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and x, y are in the domain of the form $\mathfrak{a}_0$, and a corresponding operator family $T(\lambda)$. Using form methods we define a generalized Rayleigh functional and characterize the eigenvalues above the essential spectrum of $\mathscr{A}$ by a min-max and a max-min variational principle. The obtained results are illustrated with a damped beam equation.

Keywords: block operator matrices; variational principle; operator function; second-order equations; spectrum; essential spectrum; sectorial form

Mathematics Subject Classification: 47A56, 49R05, 47A10

1 Introduction

Variational principles are a very useful tool for the qualitative and numerical investigation of eigenvalues of self-adjoint operators and operator functions. For instance, the eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2 \le \dots$ below the essential spectrum of a self-adjoint operator A that is bounded from below and has domain $\mathscr{D}(A)$ can be characterized using the Rayleigh functional

$$p(x) = \frac{\langle Ax, x\rangle}{\langle x, x\rangle}, \qquad x \in \mathscr{D}(A),\ x \neq 0,$$

via a min-max principle or a max-min principle:

$$\lambda_n = \min_{\substack{L\subset\mathscr{D}(A)\\ \dim L = n}} \max_{x\in L\setminus\{0\}} p(x) = \max_{\substack{L\subset H\\ \dim L = n-1}} \min_{\substack{x\in\mathscr{D}(A)\setminus\{0\}\\ x\perp L}} p(x).$$

[*]Fachbereich C – Mathematik und Naturwissenschaften, Arbeitsgruppe Funktionalanalysis, Bergische Universität Wuppertal, Gaußstraße 20, D-42119 Wuppertal, Germany, bjacob@uni-wuppertal.de

[†]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Strathclyde, 26 Richmond Street, Glasgow G1 1XH, United Kingdom, m.langer@strath.ac.uk

[‡]Institut für Mathematik, Technische Universität Ilmenau, Postfach 100565, D-98684 Ilmenau, Germany, carsten.trunk@tu-ilmenau.de

Variational principles were first introduced by H. Weber, Lord Rayleigh, H. Poincaré, E. Fischer, G. Polya, and W. Ritz, H. Weyl, R. Courant (see, e.g. [4, 7, 20], and the references therein).

In this article we investigate variational principles for self-adjoint operator functions arising from variational evolution equations of the form

$$\langle \ddot{z}(t), y\rangle + \mathfrak{d}[\dot{z}(t), y] + \mathfrak{a}_0[z(t), y] = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Here $\mathfrak{a}_0$ with domain $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$ and $\mathfrak{d}$ with domain $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{d}) \supset \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$ are densely defined, symmetric and posivite sesquilinear forms on a Hilbert space H satisfying **(F1)–(F3)**, see Section 3. With this variational evolution equation we associate a Cauchy problem

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{z} \\ \dot{w} \end{pmatrix} = \mathscr{A} \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \begin{pmatrix} z(0) \\ w(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} z_0 \\ w_0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.2}$$

on $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0) \times H$ in such a way that the solutions of (1.1) equal the first component of the solutions of (1.2). For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ we define the sesquilinear form

$$\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x, y] := \lambda^2 \langle x, y\rangle + \lambda \mathfrak{d}[x, y] + \mathfrak{a}_0[x, y] \tag{1.3}$$

with domain $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)) := H_{\frac{1}{2}} := \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$. We identify a disc $\Phi_{\gamma_0} \subset \mathbb{C}$ which is the largest disc around zero with an empty intersection with the essential spectrum of $\mathscr{A}$. For $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0}$ we show that the form $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ is closed and sectorial and that the corresponding operator $T(\lambda)$ is m-sectorial. Moreover, on Φ_{γ_0} the spectrum (point spectrum) of $\mathscr{A}$ and the spectrum (resp. point spectrum) of T coincide.

In [7] R. J. Duffin proved a variational principle for eigenvalues of a quadratic matrix polynomial, which was generalized in various directions to more general operator functions; see, e.g. the references in [9] and [19]. In [9] such a variational principle was proved for eigenvalues of operator functions whose values are possibly unbounded self-adjoint operators. Here we adapt this variational principle from [9] to our situation. Using the form $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ we introduce a slightly more general definition of a generalized Rayleigh functional and we show that the variational principle generalizes to this situation. In particular, for a fixed $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \{0\}$, denote the two real solutions (if they exist) of the quadratic equation

$$\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x, x] = 0$$

by $p_-(x)$ and $p_+(x)$ such that $p_-(x) \le p_+(x)$ is satisfied and set $p_+(x) := -\infty$, $p_-(x) := \infty$ if there are no real solutions. Then the function p_+ plays the role of a generalized Rayleigh functional in our main theorem, which yields variational principles for the real eigenvalues of $\mathscr{A}$ or, what is equivalent, of T. These variational principles hold in certain real intervals Δ above the essential spectrum of $\mathscr{A}$ in the disc Φ_{γ_0} with the property that Δ does not contain values of p_-. In Δ the spectrum of $\mathscr{A}$ is either empty or consists only of a finite or infinite sequence of isolated semi-simple eigenvalues of finite multiplicity of $\mathscr{A}$. Moreover, we show that these eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \ge \lambda_2 \ge \cdots$, counted according to their multiplicities, satisfy

$$\lambda_n = \max_{\substack{L \subset H_{1/2} \\ \dim L = n}} \min_{x \in L \setminus \{0\}} p_+(x) = \min_{\substack{L \subset H \\ \dim L = n-1}} \sup_{\substack{x \in H_{1/2} \setminus \{0\} \\ x \perp L}} p_+(x)$$

and, if $N < \infty$, we show for $n > N$ that

$$\sup_{\substack{L \subset \mathscr{D} \\ \dim L = n}} \min_{x \in L \setminus \{0\}} p_+(x) \le \inf \Delta \qquad \text{and} \qquad \inf_{\substack{L \subset H \\ \dim L = n-1}} \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\} \\ x \perp L}} p_+(x) \le \inf \Delta.$$

A major application of this variational principle is a quite general interlacing principle which is the second main result of this article: if the stiffness operator A_0 decreases and the damping operator D increases,

then the corresponding nth eigenvalue decreases compared with the nth eigenvalue of the unchanged system. We illustrate the obtained results with an example where we consider a beam equation with a damping such that A_0 corresponds to the fourth derivative on the interval $(0,1)$ (with some appropriate boundary conditions) and the damping D equals $-\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}d\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}$ with some smooth function d (and some boundary conditions).

We proceed as follows. The variational principle obtained in [9] is adapted to the setting of this paper in Section 2. Section 3 is devoted to general properties of the class of second-order systems studied in this paper. The main results of this paper are proved in Section 4. In particular, we study the form (1.3) and their relation to the operator matrix $\mathscr{A}$ and the operator function $T(\lambda)$. On a disc Φ_{γ_0} around zero, $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ is a closed sectorial form and the spectrum (point spectrum) of $\mathscr{A}$ and the spectrum (point spectrum) of T coincide. Further, the variational principles for $\mathscr{A}$ are presented in Theorem 4.8. As an application of the variational principle we show interlacing properties of eigenvalues of two different second-order problems with coefficients which satisfy a specific order relation. Finally, in Section 5 we apply the obtained results to a damped beam equation.

Throughout this paper we use the following notation. For a self-adjoint operator S and an interval I we denote by $\mathscr{L}_I(S)$ the spectral subspace of S corresponding to I. A closed, densely defined operator in H is called *Fredholm* if the dimension of its kernel and the (algebraic) co-dimension of its range are finite. The *essential spectrum* of a closed, densely defined operator S is defined by

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(S) := \big\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid S - \lambda I \text{ is not Fredholm}\big\}.$$

A closed, densely defined operator T is called *sectorial* if its numerical range is contained in a sector $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re} z \geq z_0,\ |\arg(z-z_0)| \leq \theta\}$ for some $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2})$. A sectorial operator T is called *m-sectorial* if $\lambda \in \rho(T)$ for some λ with $\operatorname{Re}\lambda < z_0$; see, e.g. [15, §V.3.10]. For a sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{a}[\cdot,\cdot]$ with domain $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a})$ the corresponding quadratic form is defined by $\mathfrak{a}[x] := \mathfrak{a}[x,x]$, $x \in \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a})$. A form is called *sectorial* if its numerical range is contained in a sector $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re} z \geq z_0,\ |\arg(z-z_0)| \leq \theta\}$ for some $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2})$; see, e.g. [15, §V.3.10].

2 A general variational principle for self-adjoint operator functions

In this section we recall a general variational principle for eigenvalues of a self-adjoint operator function from [9] adapted to the present situation. Here we also show some additional statements. We mention that in [9] a more general class of operator functions was investigated.

For the rest of this section let $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval with

$$a = \inf\Delta \quad \text{and} \quad b = \sup\Delta, \qquad -\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty, \tag{2.1}$$

and let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ such that $\Delta \subset \Omega$. On Ω we consider a family of closed, densely defined operators $T(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \Omega$, in a Hilbert space H with inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$, where $T(\lambda)$ has domain $\mathscr{D}(T(\lambda))$. In the following we shall assume that either $T(\lambda)$ or $-T(\lambda)$ is an m-sectorial operator for $\lambda \in \Omega$. Under this assumption the sesquilinear form $\langle T(\lambda)\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is closable for $\lambda \in \Omega$, and we denote the closure by $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[\cdot,\cdot]$ with domain $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{t}(\lambda))$ and set $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] := \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x,x]$, which is the corresponding quadratic form. Recall (see, e.g. [15, §VII.4]) that $T := (T(\lambda))_{\lambda\in\Omega}$ is called a *holomorphic family of type* (B) if $T(\lambda)$ is m-sectorial for $\lambda \in \Omega$, the domain $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{t}(\lambda))$ of the closed quadratic form $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ is independent of λ, which we denote by $\mathscr{D}$, and $\lambda \mapsto \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]$ is holomorphic on Ω for every $x \in \mathscr{D}$.

We suppose that one of the following two conditions is satisfied.

(I) Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and $\Delta \subset \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}$ an interval with endpoints a, b as in (2.1). The family $(T(\lambda))_{\lambda\in\Omega}$ is a holomorphic family of type (B), $T(\lambda)$ is self-adjoint for $\lambda \in \Delta$ and there exists a $c \in \Delta$ such that $\dim \mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}(T(c)) < \infty$.

(II) Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and $\Delta \subset \Omega \cap \mathbb{R}$ an interval with endpoints a, b as in (2.1). The family $(-T(\lambda))_{\lambda\in\Omega}$ is a holomorphic family of type (B), $T(\lambda)$ is self-adjoint for $\lambda \in \Delta$ and there exists a $c \in \Delta$ such that $\dim \mathscr{L}_{(0,\infty)}(T(c)) < \infty$.

Note that under assumption (I) for $\lambda \in \Delta$ the operators $T(\lambda)$ are self-adjoint and sectorial, and, hence, bounded from below. Similarly, under assumption (II), the operators $T(\lambda)$ are bounded from above for $\lambda \in \Delta$. The condition $\dim \mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}(T(c)) < \infty$ is equivalent to the fact that $\sigma(T(c)) \cap (-\infty, 0)$ consists of at most a finite number of eigenvalues of finite multiplicities.

Before we formulate the second set of assumptions, let us recall the following definitions. The *spectrum* of the operator function T is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(T) &:= \big\{\lambda \in \Omega \mid T(\lambda) \text{ is not bijective from } \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda)) \text{ onto } H\big\}\\ &= \big\{\lambda \in \Omega \mid 0 \in \sigma(T(\lambda))\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the *essential spectrum* of the operator function T is defined as

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(T) := \big\{\lambda \in \Omega \mid T(\lambda) \text{ is not Fredholm}\big\} = \big\{\lambda \in \Omega \mid 0 \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(T(\lambda))\big\}.$$

A number $\lambda \in \Omega$ is called an *eigenvalue* of the operator function T if there exists an $x \in \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda))$, $x \neq 0$, such that $T(\lambda)x = 0$. The *point spectrum* is the set of all eigenvalues:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{\text{p}}(T) &:= \big\{\lambda \in \Omega \mid \exists x \in \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda)), x \neq 0, T(\lambda)x = 0\big\}\\ &= \big\{\lambda \in \Omega \mid 0 \in \sigma_{\text{p}}(T(\lambda))\big\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_{\text{p}}(T(\lambda))$ denotes the point spectrum of the operator $T(\lambda)$ for fixed $\lambda \in \Omega$. The *geometric multiplicity* of an eigenvalue λ of the operator function T is defined as the dimension of $\ker T(\lambda)$.

In addition to (I) or (II) we shall assume that one of the following two conditions ($\searrow$), ($\nearrow$) is satisfied.

($\searrow$) For every $x \in \mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\}$ the function $\lambda \mapsto \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]$ is *decreasing at value zero* on Δ, i.e. if $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda_0)[x] = 0$ for some $\lambda_0 \in \Delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] &> 0 \qquad \text{for } \lambda \in (-\infty, \lambda_0) \cap \Delta,\\ \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] &< 0 \qquad \text{for } \lambda \in (\lambda_0, \infty) \cap \Delta.\end{aligned}$$

($\nearrow$) For every $x \in \mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\}$ the function $\lambda \mapsto \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]$ is *increasing at value zero* on Δ, i.e. if $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda_0)[x] = 0$ for some $\lambda_0 \in \Delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] &< 0 \qquad \text{for } \lambda \in (-\infty, \lambda_0) \cap \Delta,\\ \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] &> 0 \qquad \text{for } \lambda \in (\lambda_0, \infty) \cap \Delta.\end{aligned}$$

If T satisfies ($\nearrow$) or ($\searrow$), then, for $x \in \mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\}$, the scalar function $\lambda \mapsto \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]$ is either decreasing or increasing at a zero and, hence, it has at most one zero in Δ.

We now introduce the notion of a generalized Rayleigh functional p, which is a mapping from $\mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\}$ to $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$. If there is a zero λ_0 of the scalar function $\lambda \mapsto \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]$ in Δ, then the corresponding value of a generalized Rayleigh functional $p(x)$ must equal this zero; $p(x) = \lambda_0$. Otherwise, there is some freedom in the definition. More precisely, we use the following definition.

Definition 2.1. Let Δ and Ω be as above. Moreover, let $T(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \Omega$, be a family of closed operators in a Hilbert space H satisfying either (I) or (II) and which satisfies also ($\nearrow$) or ($\searrow$). In the case ($\searrow$) a

mapping $p : \mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ with the properties

$$p(x)\begin{cases} = \lambda_0 & \text{if } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda_0)[x] = 0, \\ < a & \text{if } a \in \Delta \text{ and } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] < 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta, \\ \leq a & \text{if } a \notin \Delta \text{ and } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] < 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta, \\ > b & \text{if } b \in \Delta \text{ and } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] > 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta, \\ \geq b & \text{if } b \notin \Delta \text{ and } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] > 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta. \end{cases}$$

is called a *generalized Rayleigh functional* for T on Δ. In the case ($\nearrow$) a mapping $p : \mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ with the properties

$$p(x)\begin{cases} = \lambda_0 & \text{if } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda_0)[x] = 0, \\ > b & \text{if } b \in \Delta \text{ and } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] < 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta, \\ \geq b & \text{if } b \notin \Delta \text{ and } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] < 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta, \\ < a & \text{if } a \in \Delta \text{ and } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] > 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta, \\ \leq a & \text{if } a \notin \Delta \text{ and } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] > 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

is called a *generalized Rayleigh functional* for T on Δ.

Remark 2.2. One possible choice for p in the case ($\searrow$) is the following (see [4, 9]). For $x \in \mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\}$ set

$$p(x) = \begin{cases} \lambda_0 & \text{if } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda_0)[x] = 0, \\ -\infty & \text{if } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] < 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta, \\ +\infty & \text{if } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] > 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta, \end{cases}$$

which was used as a definition of a generalized Rayleigh functional in [4, 9]. However, here we propose to use the Definition 2.1. This has the following advantage: if p is a generalized Rayleigh functional for T on Δ, then the same p remains a generalized Rayleigh functional in the sense of Definition 2.1 for T on a smaller interval Δ' with $\Delta' \subset \Delta$. Moreover, in many applications, including the one in Section 4, the operator function T is defined on a larger interval $\tilde{\Delta} \supset \Delta$ but satisfies, say, ($\searrow$) only on Δ. If $\mathfrak{t}(\cdot)[x]$ has a zero λ_0 in $\tilde{\Delta}$ where $\lambda_0 < a$ and $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] < 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Delta$, one can set $p(x) := \lambda_0$.

Example 2.3. We consider two examples to illustrate the notion of a generalized Rayleigh functional.

(i) Let A be a bounded self-adjoint operator in a Hilbert space H and consider the operator function $T(\lambda) = A - \lambda I$, $\lambda \in \Omega = \mathbb{C}$. The corresponding quadratic forms are $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] = \langle Ax, x\rangle - \lambda \|x\|^2$, $x \in \mathscr{D} = H$. If we take $\Delta = \mathbb{R}$, then T satisfies condition (I), where one can choose any $c < \min \sigma(A)$; it also satisfies (II), where one can choose any $c > \max \sigma(A)$. Moreover, the function T satisfies condition ($\searrow$) since $\mathfrak{t}'(\lambda)[x] = -\|x\|^2$. For each $x \in H \setminus \{0\}$ the function $\mathfrak{t}(\cdot)[x]$ has the unique zero

$$p(x) = \frac{\langle Ax, x\rangle}{\|x\|^2};$$

hence the classical Rayleigh quotient is a generalized Rayleigh functional in the sense of Definition 2.1.

(ii) In $H=\mathbb{C}^2$ consider the quadratic operator function

$$T(\lambda)=\begin{bmatrix}\lambda^2-2\lambda+1 & -2\\ -2 & \lambda^2+1\end{bmatrix},\qquad \lambda\in\Omega:=\mathbb{C},$$

and choose $\Delta:=(-\infty,0)$. Clearly, conditions (I) and (II) are satisfied. For $x=\binom{x_1}{x_2}\in\mathbb{C}^2$ one has

$$\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]=\langle T(\lambda)x,x\rangle=\|x\|^2\lambda^2-2|x_1|^2\lambda+\|x\|^2-4\operatorname{Re}(x_1\overline{x_2}).$$

Since the coefficient of λ is non-positive, the sum of the two zeros of the polynomial $\mathfrak{t}(\cdot)[x]$ is non-negative if $x\neq 0$, and therefore at most one zero can be in Δ. At any such zero the function must be decreasing, which shows that condition $(\searrow)$ is satisfied. Moreover, $\mathfrak{t}(\cdot)[x]$ is positive on Δ if it has no negative zero. Hence a possible choice for a generalized Rayleigh functional is given by

$$p(x)=\begin{cases}\dfrac{|x_1|^2-\sqrt{|x_1|^4-\|x\|^2+4\operatorname{Re}(x_1\overline{x_2})}}{\|x\|^2} & \text{if } |x_1|^4-\|x\|^2+4\operatorname{Re}(x_1\overline{x_2})\geq 0,\\ \infty & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Note that three cases occur: (a) $\mathfrak{t}(\cdot)[x]$ has a positive and a negative zero, in which case $p(x)$ equals the negative zero; (b) $\mathfrak{t}(\cdot)[x]$ has two positive zeros, in which case $p(x)>0=\sup\Delta$; (c) $\mathfrak{t}(\cdot)[x]$ has no real zeros, in which case $p(x)=\infty$. Examples for these three cases are given by the vectors $\binom{1}{1}$, $\binom{2}{-1}$, $\binom{1}{-1}$, respectively.

For a generalized Rayleigh functional p as in Definition 2.1 we have for $\lambda\in\Delta$, $x\in\mathscr{D}(T(\lambda))\setminus\{0\}$,

$$T(\lambda)x=0 \quad\Longrightarrow\quad p(x)=\lambda.$$

If T satisfies $(\searrow)$, then for $x\in\mathscr{D}\setminus\{0\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]>0 &\iff p(x)>\lambda,\\ \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]<0 &\iff p(x)<\lambda;\end{aligned}\tag{2.3}$$

if T satisfies $(\nearrow)$, then for $x\in\mathscr{D}\setminus\{0\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]>0 &\iff p(x)<\lambda,\\ \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]<0 &\iff p(x)>\lambda.\end{aligned}\tag{2.4}$$

In [9, Theorem 2.1] a variational principle involving a generalized Rayleigh functional was derived. There the generalized Rayleigh functional was defined as in Remark 2.2 and not in the (slightly more general) way as in Definition 2.1. Therefore, the variational principle in the following theorem is an adapted version of [9, Theorem 2.1] where a non-decreasing sequence of eigenvalues of an operator function is characterized. Moreover, in [9, Theorem 2.1] only the case (I), $(\searrow)$ was considered (under slightly weaker assumptions on $\mathfrak{t}$).

Theorem 2.4. *Let Δ and Ω be as above. Moreover, let $T(\lambda)$, $\lambda\in\Omega$, be a family of closed operators in a Hilbert space H satisfying either* (I), $(\searrow)$ *or* (II), $(\nearrow)$, *let p be a generalized Rayleigh functional and assume that*

$$\Delta':=\begin{cases}\Delta & \text{if } \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)\cap\Delta=\emptyset,\\ \{\lambda\in\Delta\mid\lambda<\inf(\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)\cap\Delta)\} & \text{if } \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)\cap\Delta\neq\emptyset,\end{cases}$$

is non-empty.

Then $\sigma(T)\cap\Delta'$ is either empty or consists only of a finite or infinite sequence of isolated eigenvalues of T with finite geometric multiplicities, which in the case of infinitely many eigenvalues in $\sigma(T)\cap\Delta'$ accumulates only at $\sup\Delta'$ (which equals $\inf(\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)\cap\Delta)$ if $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)\cap\Delta\neq\emptyset$ and equals b otherwise).

If $\sigma(T)\cap\Delta'$ is empty, then set $N:=0$; otherwise, denote the eigenvalues in $\sigma(T)\cap\Delta'$ by $(\lambda_j)_{j=1}^{N}$, $N\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{\infty\}$, in non-decreasing order, counted according to their geometric multiplicities: $\lambda_1\leq\lambda_2\leq\cdots$. Choose $a'\in\Delta'$ so that in the case $N>0$ it satisfies $a'\leq\lambda_1$. Then the quantity

$$\kappa:=\begin{cases}\dim\mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}\big(T(a')\big) & \text{if (I), ($\searrow$) are satisfied,}\\ \dim\mathscr{L}_{(0,\infty)}\big(T(a')\big) & \text{if (II), ($\nearrow$) are satisfied,}\end{cases}$$

is a finite number. Moreover, the nth eigenvalue λ_n, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $n\leq N$, satisfies

$$\lambda_n=\min_{\substack{L\subset\mathscr{D}\\ \dim L=\kappa+n}}\ \sup_{x\in L\setminus\{0\}}\ p(x), \tag{2.5}$$

$$\lambda_n=\max_{\substack{L\subset H\\ \dim L=\kappa+n-1}}\ \inf_{\substack{x\in\mathscr{D}\setminus\{0\}\\ x\perp L}}\ p(x). \tag{2.6}$$

For subspaces L with dimensions not considered in (2.5) *and* (2.6) *the right-hand side of* (2.5) *and* (2.6) *gives values with the following properties: if $\kappa>0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\inf_{\substack{L\subset\mathscr{D}\\ \dim L=n}}\ \sup_{x\in L\setminus\{0\}}\ p(x)\leq a\\ &\sup_{\substack{L\subset H\\ \dim L=n-1}}\ \inf_{\substack{x\in\mathscr{D}\setminus\{0\}\\ x\perp L}}\ p(x)\leq a\end{aligned}\qquad \text{for } n=1,\dots,\kappa; \tag{2.7}$$

if $N<\infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned}&\inf_{\substack{L\subset\mathscr{D}\\ \dim L=n}}\ \sup_{x\in L\setminus\{0\}}\ p(x)\geq\sup\Delta'\\ &\sup_{\substack{L\subset H\\ \dim L=n-1}}\ \inf_{\substack{x\in\mathscr{D}\setminus\{0\}\\ x\perp L}}\ p(x)\geq\sup\Delta'\end{aligned}\qquad \text{for } n>\kappa+N \text{ with } n\leq\dim H. \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. Let us first consider the case when (I), ($\searrow$) are satisfied. We apply [9, Theorem 2.1]. Since T is a holomorphic family of type (B), [9, Proposition 2.13] implies that conditions (i) and (ii) of [9, Theorem 2.1] are satisfied. It follows directly from (I) and ($\searrow$) that (iii) and (iv) of [9, Theorem 2.1] are also satisfied. Now [9, Theorem 2.1] implies that $\sigma(T)\cap\Delta'$ is either empty or consists of a sequence of isolated eigenvalues that can accumulate at most at $\sup\Delta'$.

Set

$$\Delta_1:=\begin{cases}\Delta' & \text{if } N=0,\\ \{\mu\in\Delta'\mid\mu\leq\lambda_1\} & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

In [9, Theorem 2.1] the number κ was defined as $\dim\mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}\big(T(a'')\big)$ with a particular choice of $a''\in\Delta_1$. However, the function

$$\lambda\mapsto\dim\mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}\big(T(\lambda)\big)$$

is constant on Δ_1 by [9, Lemma 2.6]. Hence we choose an arbitrary $a'\in\Delta_1$ for the definition of κ, which by [9, Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.6] is a finite number:

$$\kappa=\dim\mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}\big(T(a')\big).$$

Let us now prove (2.5). In [9] a special choice of a generalized Rayleigh functional was considered; see Remark 2.2. In order to distinguish it, we denote it by q, i.e. for $x \in \mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\}$ we set

$$q(x) := \begin{cases} \lambda_0 & \text{if } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda_0)[x] = 0, \\ -\infty & \text{if } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] < 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta, \\ +\infty & \text{if } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] > 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in \Delta. \end{cases}$$

If $p(x) \in \Delta$ or $q(x) \in \Delta$ holds for some $x \in \mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\}$, then by the definition of p and q we have $\mathfrak{t}(p(x))[x] = 0$ or $\mathfrak{t}(q(x))[x] = 0$, respectively, and thus $p(x) = q(x)$ follows. In [9, Theorem 2.1] it was proved that

$$\lambda_n = \min_{\substack{L \subset \mathscr{D} \\ \dim L = \kappa + n}} \max_{x \in L \setminus \{0\}} q(x)$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \leq N$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \leq N$. There exists a subspace $L_0 \subset \mathscr{D}$ with $\dim L_0 = \kappa + n$ such that

$$\max_{x \in L_0 \setminus \{0\}} q(x) = \lambda_n,$$

which implies in particular that $q(x) \leq \lambda_n$ for all $x \in L_0 \setminus \{0\}$. If, for $x \in L_0 \setminus \{0\}$, we have $q(x) = -\infty$, then $p(x) \leq a$ by the definitions of p and q, and hence $p(x) \leq \lambda_n$. If, for $x \in L_0 \setminus \{0\}$, we have $q(x) \neq -\infty$, then $q(x) \in \Delta$ and hence $p(x) = q(x) \leq \lambda_n$. This implies that

$$\sup_{x \in L_0 \setminus \{0\}} p(x) \leq \max_{x \in L_0 \setminus \{0\}} q(x) = \lambda_n. \tag{2.9}$$

Let $L \subset \mathscr{D}$ be an arbitrary subspace with $\dim L = \kappa + n$. Then, by the definition of L_0,

$$\max_{x \in L \setminus \{0\}} q(x) \geq \max_{x \in L_0 \setminus \{0\}} q(x) = \lambda_n.$$

Hence there exists an $x_0 \in L \setminus \{0\}$ with $q(x_0) \geq \lambda_n$. If $q(x_0) = +\infty$, then $p(x_0) \geq b$ and, in particular, $p(x_0) \geq \lambda_n$. If $q(x_0) \neq +\infty$, then $q(x_0) \in \Delta$, which implies that $p(x_0) = q(x_0) \geq \lambda_n$. Hence

$$\sup_{x \in L \setminus \{0\}} p(x) \geq \lambda_n. \tag{2.10}$$

By (2.9) and (2.10) we obtain (2.5). Equation (2.6) is shown in a similar way.

Next we prove the first inequality in (2.7). Let $n \leq \kappa$ and let $\lambda \in \Delta_1$ be arbitrary. We have seen above that $\dim \mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}(T(\lambda)) = \kappa$. Therefore we can choose an n-dimensional subspace of $\mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}(T(\lambda))$, which we denote by L_0 and which is contained in $\mathscr{D}(T(\lambda)) \subset \mathscr{D}$. Since $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] < 0$ for all $x \in L_0 \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$\inf_{\substack{L \subset \mathscr{D} \\ \dim L = n}} \sup_{x \in L \setminus \{0\}} p(x) \leq \sup_{x \in L_0 \setminus \{0\}} p(x) \leq \lambda.$$

This implies the first inequality in (2.7) since $\lambda \in \Delta_1$ was arbitrary. The second inequality in (2.7) is shown in a similar way.

We show the first inequality in (2.8). Let $n > \kappa + N$. If we have $\lambda_N = b = \sup \Delta'$, then (2.8) follows from (2.5). In all other cases, choose $\lambda \in \Delta'$ such that $\lambda > \lambda_N$ if $N > 0$. It follows from [9, Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7] that $\dim \mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}(T(\lambda)) = \kappa + N$. Hence, for each subspace $L \subset \mathscr{D}$ with $\dim L = n$, there exists an $x_0 \in L \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x_0] \geq 0$. Therefore

$$\sup_{x \in L \setminus \{0\}} p(x) \geq p(x_0) \geq \lambda.$$

Since this is true for every such L, we have

$$\inf_{\substack{L\subset\mathscr{D}\\ \dim L=n}} \sup_{x\in L\setminus\{0\}} p(x) \geq \lambda,$$

which implies the validity of the first inequality in (2.8) as λ can be chosen arbitrarily close to $\sup\Delta'$; see [9, Lemma 2.6]. In a similar way one can show the second inequality in (2.8).

If instead of (I), ($\searrow$) the assumptions (II), ($\nearrow$) are satisfied, then the function $\widetilde{T}(\lambda) := -T(\lambda)$ satisfies the assumptions (I), ($\searrow$) and $\widetilde{p}(x) := p(x)$ is a generalized Rayleigh functional for $\widetilde{T}$ on Δ, see Definition 2.1. Hence we can apply the already proved statements to $\widetilde{T}$, which imply all assertions also in this situation as $\sigma_{\mathrm{p}}(\widetilde{T}) = \sigma_{\mathrm{p}}(T)$. □

Remark 2.5.

(i) Instead of assuming that T is a holomorphic family of type (B) it is sufficient to assume some weaker continuity properties. Also the domain of the quadratic form may depend on λ. For further details see [9], in particular, the assumptions (i) and (ii) there.

(ii) If the functional p is chosen such that it is continuous as a mapping from $\mathscr{D}$ into the extended real numbers $\mathbb{R}\cup\{\pm\infty\}$ and $p(cx) = p(x)$ for all $c\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ and $x\in\mathscr{D}$, then the supremum in (2.5) is actually a maximum, i.e. the eigenvalue λ_n, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $n\leq N$, satisfies

$$\lambda_n = \min_{\substack{L\subset\mathscr{D}\\ \dim L=\kappa+n}} \max_{x\in L\setminus\{0\}} p(x).$$

This follows from the fact that it is sufficient to take the supremum over the set $\{x\in L \mid \|x\|=1\}$, which is compact. The same statement applies to (2.7) and (2.8).

A similar theorem holds if we replace in Theorem 2.4 the assumption (I), ($\searrow$) by (I), ($\nearrow$) and (II), ($\nearrow$) by (II), ($\searrow$), respectively, and change Δ' accordingly. This is done in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.6. *Let Δ and Ω be as above. Moreover, let $T(\lambda)$, $\lambda\in\Omega$, be a family of closed operators in a Hilbert space H satisfying either* (I), ($\nearrow$) *or* (II), ($\searrow$), *let p be a generalized Rayleigh functional and assume that*

$$\Delta' := \begin{cases} \Delta & \text{if } \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)\cap\Delta = \emptyset,\\ \{\lambda\in\Delta \mid \lambda > \sup(\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)\cap\Delta)\} & \text{if } \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)\cap\Delta\neq\emptyset, \end{cases}$$

is non-empty.

Then $\sigma(T)\cap\Delta'$ is either empty or consists only of a finite or infinite sequence of isolated eigenvalues of T with finite geometric multiplicities, which in the case of infinitely many eigenvalues in $\sigma(T)\cap\Delta'$ accumulates only at $\inf\Delta'$ (*which equals* $\sup(\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)\cap\Delta)$ *if $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)\cap\Delta\neq\emptyset$ and equals a otherwise*).

If $\sigma(T)\cap\Delta'$ is empty, then set $N := 0$; otherwise, denote the eigenvalues in $\sigma(T)\cap\Delta'$ by $(\lambda_j)_{j=1}^N$, $N\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{\infty\}$, in non-increasing order, counted according to their geometric multiplicities: $\lambda_1\geq\lambda_2\geq\cdots$. Choose $b'\in\Delta'$ so that in the case $N>0$ it satisfies $\lambda_1\leq b'$. Then the quantity

$$\kappa := \begin{cases} \dim\mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}\big(T(b')\big) & \text{if (I), ($\nearrow$) are satisfied},\\ \dim\mathscr{L}_{(0,\infty)}\big(T(b')\big) & \text{if (II), ($\searrow$) are satisfied}, \end{cases}$$

is a finite number. Moreover, the nth eigenvalue λ_n, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $n\leq N$, satisfies

$$\lambda_n = \max_{\substack{L\subset\mathscr{D}\\ \dim L=\kappa+n}} \inf_{x\in L\setminus\{0\}} p(x), \tag{2.11}$$

$$\lambda_n = \min_{\substack{L\subset H\\ \dim L=\kappa+n-1}} \sup_{\substack{x\in\mathscr{D}\setminus\{0\}\\ x\perp L}} p(x). \tag{2.12}$$

For subspaces L with dimensions not considered in (2.11) *and* (2.12) *the right-hand side of* (2.11) *and* (2.12) *gives values with the following properties: if $\kappa > 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\substack{L\subset\mathscr{D}\\ \dim L=n}} \inf_{x\in L\setminus\{0\}} p(x) \geq b \\ &\inf_{\substack{L\subset H\\ \dim L=n-1}} \sup_{\substack{x\in\mathscr{D}\setminus\{0\}\\ x\perp L}} p(x) \geq b \end{aligned} \qquad \text{for } n=1,\dots,\kappa; \tag{2.13}$$

if $N<\infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\substack{L\subset\mathscr{D}\\ \dim L=n}} \inf_{x\in L\setminus\{0\}} p(x) \leq \inf\Delta' \\ &\inf_{\substack{L\subset H\\ \dim L=n-1}} \sup_{\substack{x\in\mathscr{D}\setminus\{0\}\\ x\perp L}} p(x) \leq \inf\Delta' \end{aligned} \qquad \text{for } n>\kappa+N \text{ with } n\leq \dim H. \tag{2.14}$$

Proof. The theorem follows from Theorem 2.4 applied to the function $\widehat{T}(\lambda) := T(-\lambda)$, $-\lambda\in\Omega$. With $\widehat{a} := -b$, $\widehat{b} := -a$ and $\widehat{\Delta} := \{-\lambda \mid \lambda\in\Delta\}$ all assumptions of Theorem 2.4 are satisfied, namely (I) and (II) remain the same and ($\searrow$) turns into ($\nearrow$) and vice versa. That is, $\widehat{T}$ satisfies either (I), ($\searrow$) or (II), ($\nearrow$). Then the mapping $\widehat{p}(x) := -p(x)$ is a generalized Rayleigh functional for $\widehat{T}$ on $\widehat{\Delta}$; see Definition 2.1. Since $\widehat{\lambda}_n = -\lambda_n$ for $\widehat{\lambda}_n\in\sigma_{\mathrm{p}}(\widehat{T})$, all assertions of Theorem 2.6 follow from Theorem 2.4. □

Remark 2.7. If the functional p is chosen such that it is continuous and $p(cx)=p(x)$ for $c\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ and $x\in\mathscr{D}$ (see Remark 2.5), then the infimum in (2.11) is actually a minimum, i.e. the eigenvalue λ_n, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $n\leq N$, satisfies

$$\lambda_n = \max_{\substack{L\subset\mathscr{D}\\ \dim L=\kappa+n}} \min_{x\in L\setminus\{0\}} p(x).$$

A similar statement applies to (2.13) and (2.14).

3 Framework

Let H be a Hilbert space and let $\mathfrak{a}_0$ and $\mathfrak{d}$ be sesquilinear forms on H with domains $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$ and $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{d})$, respectively, such that the following conditions are satisfied.

- **(F1)** The sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{a}_0$ is densely defined, closed, symmetric and bounded from below by a positive constant, i.e. $\exists\, c_1>0$ such that $\mathfrak{a}_0[x]\geq c_1\|x\|^2$ for $x\in\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$.
- **(F2)** The sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{d}$ is symmetric, satisfies $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{d})\supset\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$, and there exists a $c_2>0$ such that
$$0\leq \mathfrak{d}[x]\leq c_2\mathfrak{a}_0[x] \qquad \text{for all } x\in\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0).$$

It is our aim to study the following second order differential equation

$$\langle \ddot{z}(t), y\rangle + \mathfrak{d}[\dot{z}(t), y] + \mathfrak{a}_0[z(t), y] = 0 \qquad \text{for all } y\in\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0). \tag{3.1}$$

In a first step we find an equivalent Cauchy problem. Then, using the standard theory of semigroups, we obtain solutions of (3.1). Therefore we associate with the form $\mathfrak{a}_0$ a positive definite self-adjoint operator A_0 with $\mathscr{D}(A_0)\subset\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$ and $0\in\rho(A_0)$ via the First Representation Theorem [15, Theorem VI.2.1], i.e.

$$\mathfrak{a}_0[x,y] = \langle A_0x, y\rangle \qquad \text{for all } x\in\mathscr{D}(A_0),\ y\in\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0). \tag{3.2}$$

The operator A_0 is called *stiffness operator*. The Second Representation Theorem [15, Theorem VI.2.6] shows $\mathscr{D}(A_0^{1/2}) = \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$ and

$$\mathfrak{a}_0[x,y] = \langle A_0^{1/2}x, A_0^{1/2}y\rangle \qquad \text{for all } x,y \in \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0).$$

We define the two spaces

$$H_{\frac{1}{2}} := \mathscr{D}(A_0^{1/2}) \qquad \text{with norm} \quad \|x\|_{H_{\frac{1}{2}}} := \left\|A_0^{1/2}x\right\|_H \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &H_{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{ as the completion of } H \text{ with respect to the norm} \\ &\|x\|_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}}} := \left\|A_0^{-1/2}x\right\|_H. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

By continuity, A_0 and $A_0^{1/2}$ can be extended to isometric isomorphisms from $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ onto $H_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and from H onto $H_{-\frac{1}{2}}$, respectively. These extensions are also denoted by A_0 and $A_0^{1/2}$. The space $H_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ can be identified with the dual space of $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ by identifying elements $x \in H_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ with bounded linear functionals on $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ as follows

$$\langle x,y\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}}\times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} := \left\langle A_0^{-1/2}x, A_0^{1/2}y\right\rangle, \qquad x \in H_{-\frac{1}{2}}, y \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.5}$$

Note that, for $x \in H$, $y \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}$, we have

$$\langle x,y\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}}\times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} = \langle x,y\rangle_H. \tag{3.6}$$

The form $\mathfrak{a}_0$ can be expressed in terms of the extended operator A_0:

$$\mathfrak{a}_0[x,y] = \langle A_0x,y\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}}\times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} \qquad \text{for all } x,y \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}; \tag{3.7}$$

this relation is obtained from (3.2) by continuous extension.

Assumption **(F2)** implies that $\mathfrak{d}$ restricted to $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a bounded, non-negative, symmetric sesquilinear form on the Hilbert space $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Hence, by [15, Theorem VI.2.7] there exists a bounded, self-adjoint, non-negative operator $\widetilde{D}$ on $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}[x,y] = \left\langle \widetilde{D}x,y\right\rangle_{H_{\frac{1}{2}}} \qquad \text{for all } x,y \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Now we define the *damping operator* D by

$$D := A_0\widetilde{D},$$

where A_0 is considered as a bounded operator from $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ onto $H_{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Clearly, the operator D is bounded from $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ to $H_{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Using (3.5) we obtain the following connection between $\mathfrak{d}$ and D:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}[x,y] &= \left\langle \widetilde{D}x,y\right\rangle_{H_{\frac{1}{2}}} = \left\langle A_0^{1/2}\widetilde{D}x, A_0^{1/2}y\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle A_0^{-1/2}Dx, A_0^{1/2}y\right\rangle = \langle Dx,y\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}}\times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

for $x,y \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}$.

We consider the following standard first-order evolution equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = \mathscr{A}x(t) \tag{3.9}$$

in the space $\mathscr{H} := H_{\frac{1}{2}} \times H$ where $\mathscr{A} : \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}) \subset \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{H}$ is given by

$$\mathscr{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -A_0 & -D \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix} \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \times H_{\frac{1}{2}} \;\middle|\; A_0 z + Dw \in H \right\}. \tag{3.11}$$

It is easy to see (e.g. [18]) that $\mathscr{A}$ has a bounded inverse in $\mathscr{H}$ given by

$$\mathscr{A}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -A_0^{-1}D & -A_0^{-1} \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\widetilde{D} & -A_0^{-1} \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3.12}$$

where $A_0^{-1}D$ is considered as an operator acting in $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and I is the embedding from $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ into H. The operator $\mathscr{A}$ itself is not self-adjoint in the Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$. However, with

$$J := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{bmatrix}$$

the operator $J\mathscr{A}$ is symmetric in $\mathscr{H}$. Since $\mathscr{A}$ has a bounded inverse, the operator $J\mathscr{A}$ is even self-adjoint in $\mathscr{H}$. Therefore,

$$\mathscr{A}^* = J\mathscr{A}J, \qquad \text{with } \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^*) = J\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A})$$

(see also [21, Proof of Lemma 4.5]) and

$$\operatorname{Re}\langle \mathscr{A}x, x\rangle \le 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{Re}\langle \mathscr{A}^*x, x\rangle \le 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A}^*).$$

This implies that $\mathscr{A}$ is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup of contractions on the state space $\mathscr{H}$. This fact is well known; see, e.g. [2, 3, 6, 10, 16] or [21, Proposition 5.1]. Hence, (3.9) together with an appropriate initial value has a unique (classical) solution. This implies the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that* **(F1)–(F2)** *are satisfied. For $z_0, w_0 \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ with $A_0 z_0 + Dw_0 \in H$ there exists a solution $z : \mathbb{R}^+ \to H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ of* (3.1) *that satisfies*

- *$z(0) = z_0$ and $\dot{z}(0) = w_0$;*
- *the function z is continuously differentiable in $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$;*
- *the function $\dot{z}$ is continuously differentiable in H.*

Moreover, a solution of (3.1) *with the above properties is unique and equals the first component of the classical solution of the Cauchy problem*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{z} \\ \dot{w} \end{pmatrix} = \mathscr{A} \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \begin{pmatrix} z(0) \\ w(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} z_0 \\ w_0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.13}$$

with $\binom{z_0}{w_0} \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A})$.

We mention that a similar relation holds for mild solutions of the Cauchy problem (3.13) with $\binom{z_0}{w_0}$ in $\mathscr{H}$ instead of $\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A})$ and a somehow weaker formulation of (3.1),

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\Big(\langle \dot{z}(t), y\rangle + \mathfrak{d}[z(t), y]\Big) + \mathfrak{a}_0[z(t), y] = 0 \qquad \text{for all } y \in \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0). \tag{3.14}$$

For details we refer to [6, Theorem 2.2], see also [3].

Remark 3.2. The operators A_0 and D satisfy the following conditions **(A1)** and **(A2)**, which appeared in various papers; see, e.g. [12, 14, 13].

(A1) The stiffness operator $A_0 : \mathscr{D}(A_0) \subset H \to H$ is a self-adjoint, positive definite linear operator on a Hilbert space H such that $0 \in \rho(A_0)$.

(A2) The damping operator $D : H_{\frac{1}{2}} \to H_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is a bounded operator with

$$\langle Dz, z\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}} \times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq 0, \qquad z \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Instead of starting with the forms and then constructing the operators one could also start with two operators A_0 and D that satisfy **(A1)** and **(A2)** and then define the sesquilinear forms $\mathfrak{a}_0$ and $\mathfrak{d}$ via

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a}_0[x, y] &:= \langle A_0 x, y\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}} \times H_{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\ \mathfrak{d}[x, y] &:= \langle Dx, y\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}} \times H_{\frac{1}{2}}}, \end{aligned} \qquad x, y \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It is easy to see that these forms satisfy **(F1)** and **(F2)**.

In the following we study the spectrum of $\mathscr{A}$. For $\binom{x_1}{y_1}, \binom{x_2}{y_2} \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \times H$ we define an indefinite inner product on $\mathscr{H}$ by

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ y_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}\right] := \left\langle J \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ y_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = \langle x_1, x_2\rangle_{H_{\frac{1}{2}}} - \langle y_1, y_2\rangle.$$

Then $(\mathscr{H}, [\cdot,\cdot])$ is a Krein space and $\mathscr{A}$ is a self-adjoint operator with respect to $[\cdot,\cdot]$ (note that the latter is equivalent to the self-adjointness of $J\mathscr{A}$ in $\mathscr{H}$). Hence $\sigma(\mathscr{A})$ is symmetric with respect to $\mathbb{R}$; see, e.g. [5, Theorem VI.6.1]. For the basic theory of Krein spaces and operators acting therein we refer to [1] and [5]. In the following proposition we collect the above considerations.

Proposition 3.3. *If* **(F1)** *and* **(F2)** *are satisfied, then the operator $\mathscr{A}$ is self-adjoint in the Krein space $(\mathscr{H}, [\cdot,\cdot])$, its spectrum is contained in the closed left half-plane and is symmetric with respect to the real line. The operator $\mathscr{A}$ has a bounded inverse, and it is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup of contractions on the state space $\mathscr{H}$.*

Proposition 3.3 guarantees that the spectrum of $\mathscr{A}$ is contained in $\mathbb{C}_-$, where $\mathbb{C}_-$ denotes the closed left half-plane $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re} z \leq 0\}$. Since $\mathscr{A}$ has a bounded inverse, we even have $\sigma(\mathscr{A}) \subset \mathbb{C}_- \setminus \{0\}$. However, apart from this restriction and the symmetry with respect to the real line, the spectrum of $\mathscr{A}$ is quite arbitrary; see, e.g. [11, Examples 3.5 and 3.6] and we refer to Example 3.2 in [12].

For the rest of the paper we assume that, in addition to **(F1)** and **(F2)**, also the following condition is satisfied.

(F3) The operator A_0^{-1} is a compact operator in H.

In the following we consider $\widetilde{D} = A_0^{-1}D$ and $A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}$ as bounded operators acting in $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and H, respectively. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ the relations

$$\ker\big(A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2} - \lambda\big) = A_0^{1/2}\Big(\ker\big(\widetilde{D} - \lambda\big)\Big),$$
$$\operatorname{ran}\big(A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2} - \lambda\big) = A_0^{1/2}\Big(\operatorname{ran}\big(\widetilde{D} - \lambda\big)\Big)$$

hold. This, together with the fact that $A_0^{1/2}$ is an isomorphism from $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ onto H, implies that

$$\sigma\big(A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}\big) = \sigma\big(\widetilde{D}\big), \qquad \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}\big(A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}\big) = \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}\big(\widetilde{D}\big). \tag{3.15}$$

In the next definition we introduce some numbers that are used in the following proposition for a further description of the spectrum of $\mathscr{A}$ and in the next section in connection with the study of a quadratic operator polynomial.

Definition 3.4. Set

$$\delta := \min\sigma\big(A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}\big), \qquad \gamma := \max\sigma\big(A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}\big). \tag{3.16}$$

If H is finite-dimensional, then set

$$\delta_0 := +\infty, \qquad \gamma_0 := 0; \tag{3.17}$$

otherwise, set

$$\delta_0 := \min\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}\big(A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}\big), \qquad \gamma_0 := \max\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}\big(A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}\big). \tag{3.18}$$

Moreover, if H is infinite-dimensional, $\delta_0 = 0$ and $\gamma_0 > 0$, then set

$$\delta_1 := \inf\big(\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}\big(A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}\big) \setminus \{0\}\big). \tag{3.19}$$

If H is infinite-dimensional, then clearly $0 \le \delta \le \delta_0 \le \gamma_0 \le \gamma$. The numbers δ and γ can be expressed in terms of the forms $\mathfrak{a}_0$ and $\mathfrak{d}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta &= \inf_{x\in H\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\big\langle A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}x, x\big\rangle}{\|x\|^2} = \inf_{y\in H_{1/2}\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\langle Dy, y\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}}\times H_{\frac{1}{2}}}}{\langle A_0 y, y\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}}\times H_{\frac{1}{2}}}} \\ &= \inf_{y\in H_{1/2}\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\mathfrak{d}[y]}{\mathfrak{a}_0[y]},\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

where we made the substitution $y = A_0^{-1/2}x$, and similarly

$$\gamma = \sup_{y\in H_{1/2}\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\mathfrak{d}[y]}{\mathfrak{a}_0[y]}. \tag{3.21}$$

If H is infinite-dimensional, then one can use the standard variational principle for bounded operators to express δ_0 and γ_0 in terms of $\mathfrak{a}_0$ and $\mathfrak{d}$:

$$\delta_0 = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \inf_{\substack{L\subset H_{1/2}\\ \dim L = n}} \sup_{y\in L\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\mathfrak{d}[y]}{\mathfrak{a}_0[y]}, \qquad \gamma_0 = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{\substack{L\subset H_{1/2}\\ \dim L = n}} \inf_{y\in L\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\mathfrak{d}[y]}{\mathfrak{a}_0[y]}. \tag{3.22}$$

Proposition 3.5. *Assume that* **(F1)–(F3)** *are satisfied. Then*

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A}) = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} \;\Big|\; \frac{1}{\lambda} \in \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}\big(-\widetilde{D}\big) \right\} \tag{3.23}$$

$$= \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} \;\Big|\; \frac{1}{\lambda} \in \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}\big(-A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2}\big) \right\} \tag{3.24}$$

$$\subset (-\infty, 0). \tag{3.25}$$

The spectrum in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A})$ is a discrete set consisting only of eigenvalues. Moreover, the set $\sigma(\mathscr{A}) \setminus \mathbb{R}$ has no finite accumulation point.

Moreover, the following statements are true:

- *if $\gamma_0 = 0$, then $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A}) = \emptyset$;*
- *if $\gamma_0 > 0$ and $\delta_0 = 0$, then*

$$\inf \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A}) = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } \delta_1 = 0, \\ -\dfrac{1}{\delta_1} & \text{if } \delta_1 > 0, \end{cases}$$

$$\max \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A}) = -\frac{1}{\gamma_0};$$

- *if $\delta_0 > 0$, then*

$$\min \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A}) = -\frac{1}{\delta_0} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \max \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A}) = -\frac{1}{\gamma_0}.$$

Proof. The equality in (3.23) was proved in [12, Theorem 4.1]. Relation (3.15) implies (3.24), and (3.25) follows from assumption **(F2)**. The discreteness of the spectrum in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A})$ follows from Fredholm theory and the fact that $\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A})$ is a connected set and has non-empty intersection with $\rho(\mathscr{A})$, namely $0 \in \rho(\mathscr{A}) \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A}))$ by (3.12). Corollary 5.2 in [12] implies that no point from $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A})$ is an accumulation point of the non-real spectrum of $\mathscr{A}$, which shows that the non-real spectrum has no finite accumulation point. The remaining assertions are clear. □

Note that, although A_0^{-1} is compact, the operator $\mathscr{A}^{-1}$ is in general not a compact operator in $\mathscr{H}$. In fact, $\mathscr{A}^{-1}$ is compact if and only if the operator D is compact as an operator acting from $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ into $H_{-\frac{1}{2}}$; see [17, Lemma 3.2].

4 A quadratic operator polynomial

In the following we construct a quadratic operator polynomial $T(\lambda)$ that is connected with the operator $\mathscr{A}$ and also the differential equation (3.1). Throughout this section let $\mathfrak{a}_0$ and $\mathfrak{d}$ be sesquilinear forms that satisfy **(F1)–(F3)** from Section 3. Moreover, let the operators A_0, D, $\mathscr{A}$ and the numbers δ, γ, δ_0, γ_0 be as in Section 3. It follows from (3.20) and (3.21) that

$$\delta \mathfrak{a}_0[x] \le \mathfrak{d}[x] \le \gamma \mathfrak{a}_0[x], \qquad x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.1}$$

Before we define the operator polynomial $T(\lambda)$, we need two lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. *Let R be a compact operator in H and ε an arbitrary positive number. Then there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ such that*

$$\|RA_0^{1/2}x\|^2 \leq \varepsilon \|A_0^{1/2}x\|^2 + C\|x\|^2 \qquad \text{for all } x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. The operator $RA_0^{1/2}A_0^{-1/2} = R$ is a compact operator in H. Hence $RA_0^{1/2}$ is $A_0^{1/2}$-compact; see, e.g. [15, Section IV.1.3]. By [8, Corollary III.7.7], $RA_0^{1/2}$ has $A_0^{1/2}$-bound 0, which implies the assertion (see [15, §V.4.1]). □

Define the following set, on which the operator polynomial $T(\lambda)$ will be defined:

$$\Phi_{\gamma_0} := \begin{cases} \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} \;\middle|\; |z| < \dfrac{1}{\gamma_0} \right\} & \text{if } \gamma_0 \neq 0, \\ \mathbb{C} & \text{if } \gamma_0 = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Lemma 4.2. *For $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0}$ the form $\lambda\mathfrak{d}$ is relatively bounded with respect to $\mathfrak{a}_0$ with $\mathfrak{a}_0$-bound less than 1, i.e. there exist real constants C_1, C_2 with $C_1 \geq 0$, $0 \leq C_2 < 1$ such that*

$$\left|\lambda\mathfrak{d}[x]\right| \leq C_1\|x\|^2 + C_2\mathfrak{a}_0[x] \qquad \text{for all } x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} = \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0).$$

Proof. Obviously, for $\lambda = 0$ the assertion of Lemma 4.2 is true. Let $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0} \setminus \{0\}$ and choose $\gamma' \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\gamma_0 < \gamma' < \frac{1}{|\lambda|}$. Denote by E the spectral function in H corresponding to the bounded self-adjoint operator $S := A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}$. Then, for $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\mathfrak{d}[x]\right| &= \langle Dx, x\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}} \times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} = \langle A_0^{-1/2}Dx, A_0^{1/2}x\rangle = \langle SA_0^{1/2}x, A_0^{1/2}x\rangle \\ &= \left\langle SE([0,\gamma'])A_0^{1/2}x, E([0,\gamma'])A_0^{1/2}x\right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle SE((\gamma',\infty))A_0^{1/2}x, E((\gamma',\infty))A_0^{1/2}x\right\rangle \\ &\leq \gamma' \left\|E([0,\gamma'])A_0^{1/2}x\right\|^2 + \left\|S^{1/2}E((\gamma',\infty))A_0^{1/2}x\right\|^2 \\ &\leq \gamma' \|A_0^{1/2}x\|^2 + \left\|S^{1/2}E((\gamma',\infty))A_0^{1/2}x\right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of γ_0 and the fact that $\gamma' > \gamma_0$ it follows that $E((\gamma',\infty))$ is a finite rank projection. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|\lambda|(\gamma' + \varepsilon) < 1$, which is possible because $\gamma' < \frac{1}{|\lambda|}$. Then Lemma 4.1 applied to the finite rank operator $S^{1/2}E((\gamma',\infty))$ implies that there exists a $C \geq 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\lambda\mathfrak{d}[x]\right| &\leq |\lambda|\gamma'\|A_0^{1/2}x\|^2 + |\lambda|\left(\varepsilon\|A_0^{1/2}x\|^2 + C\|x\|^2\right) \\ &= |\lambda|(\gamma' + \varepsilon)\mathfrak{a}_0[x] + |\lambda|C\|x\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\lambda\mathfrak{d}$ is $\mathfrak{a}_0$-bounded with $\mathfrak{a}_0$-bound less than 1. □

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ we define the sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ with domain $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)) = H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ by

$$\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x,y] := \lambda^2\langle x, y\rangle + \lambda\mathfrak{d}[x,y] + \mathfrak{a}_0[x,y] \qquad x, y \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{4.3}$$

and the corresponding quadratic form by $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] := \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x,x]$ for $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Note that if a function of the form $z(t) = e^{\lambda t}x$ with $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ is plugged into (3.1), then one obtains the equation $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x,y] = 0$. Using (3.7) and (3.8) we can rewrite $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ as follows:

$$\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x,y] := \left\langle \lambda^2 x + \lambda Dx + A_0 x, y \right\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}} \times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} \qquad x,y \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.4}$$

In the next proposition we introduce the representing operators $T(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0}$ and state some of their properties.

Proposition 4.3. *For $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0}$ the form $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ with domain $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)) = H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a closed sectorial form in H. The m-sectorial operator $T(\lambda)$ in H that is associated with $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda)) &= \left\{ x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \mid \lambda Dx + A_0 x \in H \right\}, \\ T(\lambda)x &= \lambda^2 x + \lambda Dx + A_0 x, \qquad\qquad x \in \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda)). \end{aligned}$$

The family $T(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0}$, of m-sectorial operators is a holomorphic family of type (B)*, which satisfies $T(\overline{\lambda}) = T(\lambda)^*$ for $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0}$. For $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0} \cap \mathbb{R}$ the operators $T(\lambda)$ are self-adjoint and bounded from below.*

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{a}_0$ is a closed symmetric non-negative form and, by Lemma 4.2, $\lambda\mathfrak{d}$ is bounded with respect to $\mathfrak{a}_0$ with $\mathfrak{a}_0$-bound less than 1, it follows from [15, Theorem VI.1.33] that $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ is closed and sectorial for $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0}$. Hence by [15, Theorem VI.2.1] there exist m-sectorial operators $T(\lambda)$ that represent the forms $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$. The form of the domain and the action of $T(\lambda)$ follow easily from [15, Theorem VI.2.1]. The domain of $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ is independent of λ, and the analyticity of $\lambda \mapsto \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]$ is clear. Hence T is a holomorphic family of type (B). Since $\mathfrak{t}(\overline{\lambda})[x,y] = \overline{\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[y,x]}$, we have $T(\overline{\lambda}) = T(\lambda)^*$; see [15, Theorem VI.2.5]. From this we obtain also the self-adjointness of $T(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0} \cap \mathbb{R}$; moreover, $T(\lambda)$ is bounded from below in this case since it is m-sectorial. □

Next we show that on Φ_{γ_0} the spectral problems for $\mathscr{A}$ and T are equivalent.

Proposition 4.4. *Consider T as a function defined on Φ_{γ_0}. On Φ_{γ_0} the spectra and point spectra of $\mathscr{A}$ and T coincide, i.e.*

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Phi_{\gamma_0} = \sigma(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Phi_{\gamma_0} = \sigma(T) = \sigma_{\mathrm{p}}(T). \tag{4.5}$$

For $\lambda_0 \in \sigma_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Phi_{\gamma_0}$ the geometric multiplicities coincide:

$$\dim\ker(\mathscr{A} - \lambda_0) = \dim\ker T(\lambda_0). \tag{4.6}$$

Moreover,

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T) = \emptyset.$$

If $\gamma_0 \neq 0$, then there are at most finitely many eigenvalues of $\mathscr{A}$ (and, hence, of T) in $\Phi_{\gamma_0} \setminus \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. First we show equality of the point spectra of $\mathscr{A}$ and T. For this, let $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0}$ and assume that $0 \in \sigma_p(T(\lambda))$. Then there exists $x \in \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda)) \setminus \{0\}$ with $\lambda^2 x + \lambda Dx + A_0 x = 0$. Therefore $\binom{x}{\lambda x} \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A})$ and

$$(\mathscr{A} - \lambda)\begin{pmatrix} x \\ \lambda x \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

Conversely, if $\lambda \in \sigma_p(\mathscr{A})$ and if $\binom{x}{y} \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A})$ is a corresponding eigenvector, one concludes that

$$y = \lambda x \quad \text{and} \quad A_0 x + Dy + \lambda y = 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Hence $x \in \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda))$ and $T(\lambda)x = 0$ with $x \neq 0$ because otherwise, $\binom{x}{y} = 0$. Therefore the point spectra of $\mathscr{A}$ and T coincide in Φ_{γ_0}. Moreover, as the first component of an eigenvector $\binom{x}{\lambda x} \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A})$ of $\mathscr{A}$ satisfies $x \in \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda))$ and $T(\lambda)x = 0$ and vice versa, the statement on the geometric multiplicities follows.

Next assume that $\lambda \in \rho(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Phi_{\gamma_0}$. Then for $g \in H$ there exists $\binom{x}{y} \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A})$ with

$$(\mathscr{A} - \lambda)\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ g \end{pmatrix}.$$

From this one concludes that

$$y = \lambda x \quad \text{and} \quad A_0 x + Dy + \lambda y = g,$$

which shows that $x \in \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda))$ and $T(\lambda)x = g$. Hence $T(\lambda)$ is surjective and, by the already proved statement about the eigenvalues, $\lambda \in \rho(T)$. Proposition 3.5 implies that $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Phi_{\gamma_0} = \emptyset$ which, together with $0 \in \rho(\mathscr{A})$ (see Proposition 3.3), gives the first equality in (4.5). Hence each point λ in Φ_{γ_0} is either an eigenvalue of $\mathscr{A}$ and, hence, of T, or belongs to the resolvent set of $\mathscr{A}$ and hence of T. This proves (4.5).

We show the statement about the essential spectrum of T. Let $\lambda \in \Phi_{\gamma_0}$. The statement is obvious for finite-dimensional H; hence let H be infinite-dimensional. By Lemma 4.2 there exist constants a, b such that $a \geq 0$, $0 \leq b < 1$ and

$$\big|\lambda\, \mathfrak{d}[x]\big| \leq a\|x\|^2 + b\mathfrak{a}_0[x], \quad x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Denote by L the spectral subspace for A_0 corresponding to the interval $\left[0, \frac{|\lambda|^2+a}{1-b} + 1\right]$. Assume that $0 \in \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T(\lambda))$. It follows from Proposition 3.5 and the definition of Φ_{γ_0} that $\lambda \notin \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A})$ and $\overline{\lambda} \notin \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A})$. Hence (4.6) implies that $\dim \ker T(\lambda) < \infty$ and

$$\dim\big(\mathrm{ran}\, T(\lambda)\big)^{\perp} = \dim\big(\ker T(\lambda)^*\big) = \dim \ker T(\overline{\lambda}) < \infty.$$

By [8, Theorem IX.1.3] there exists a singular sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $x_n \in \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda))$, $\|x_n\| = 1$, $x_n \rightharpoonup 0$ (i.e. x_n converges to 0 weakly) and $T(\lambda)x_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. We decompose x_n as follows:

$$x_n = u_n + v_n, \qquad u_n \in L,\ v_n \perp L.$$

The projection onto L is weakly continuous and L is finite-dimensional by assumption **(F3)**; therefore the sequence $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly in H to 0, $A_0 u_n \to 0$ and $\|v_n\| \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\langle T(\lambda)x_n, x_n\rangle\big| &= \big|\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x_n]\big| = \big|\lambda^2 + \lambda\,\mathfrak{d}[x_n] + \mathfrak{a}_0[x_n]\big| \\
&\geq \mathfrak{a}_0[x_n] - \big(|\lambda^2| + |\lambda\,\mathfrak{d}[x_n]|\big) \geq (1-b)\mathfrak{a}_0[x_n] - (|\lambda^2| + a) \\
&= (1-b)\left(\mathfrak{a}_0[u_n] + \mathfrak{a}_0[v_n] - \frac{|\lambda|^2 + a}{1-b}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

As $n \to \infty$, we have $\mathfrak{a}_0[u_n] \to 0$, and $\mathfrak{a}_0[v_n] \geq \big(\frac{|\lambda|^2+a}{1-b} + 1\big)\|v_n\|^2$ holds for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \big|\langle T(\lambda)x_n, x_n\rangle\big| \geq (1-b) > 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $0 \notin \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T(\lambda))$.

Finally, assume that $\gamma_0 > 0$. Suppose that there are infinitely many eigenvalues of $\mathscr{A}$ in $\Phi_{\gamma_0} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. Since $\Phi_{\gamma_0} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded set, there exists a sequence of non-real eigenvalues of $\mathscr{A}$ which converges. However, this contradicts Proposition 3.5. Hence the last statement is proved. □

In the following we prove variational principles for real eigenvalues of $\mathscr{A}$ or, what is equivalent (see Proposition 4.4), of T. To this end we introduce functionals p_+ and p_- so that p_+ serves as generalized Rayleigh functional for T on appropriate intervals. For fixed $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \{0\}$ consider the equation

$$\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] = \lambda^2 \|x\|^2 + \lambda \mathfrak{d}[x] + \mathfrak{a}_0[x] = 0 \tag{4.8}$$

as an equation in λ.

Definition 4.5. If (4.8) for $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \{0\}$ does not have a real solution, then we set

$$p_+(x) := -\infty, \qquad p_-(x) := +\infty.$$

Otherwise, we denote the solutions of (4.8) by $p_\pm(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} p_\pm(x) &:= \frac{-\mathfrak{d}[x] \pm \sqrt{\big(\mathfrak{d}[x]\big)^2 - 4\|x\|^2 \mathfrak{a}_0[x]}}{2\|x\|^2} \\ &= \frac{-\langle Dx, x\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}} \times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} \pm \sqrt{\langle Dx, x\rangle^2_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}} \times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} - 4\|x\|^2 \|A_0^{1/2} x\|^2}}{2\|x\|^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Note that the values of $p_+(x)$ and $p_-(x)$ belong to $(-\infty, 0) \cup \{\pm\infty\}$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{D}^* &:= \big\{ x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \{0\} \mid \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] = 0 \big\} \\ &= \big\{ x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \{0\} \mid p_\pm(x) \text{ are finite} \big\} \\ &= \Big\{ x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \{0\} \mid \mathfrak{d}[x] \geq 2\|x\| \sqrt{\mathfrak{a}_0[x]} \Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

and define

$$\alpha := \begin{cases} \max\Big\{ \sup\limits_{x \in \mathscr{D}^*} p_-(x), -\dfrac{1}{\gamma_0} \Big\} & \text{if } \gamma_0 > 0, \\ \sup\limits_{x \in \mathscr{D}^*} p_-(x) & \text{if } \gamma_0 = 0, \end{cases} \tag{4.11}$$

where we set $\sup_{x \in \mathscr{D}^*} p_-(x) = -\infty$ if $\mathscr{D}^* = \emptyset$.

We collect some of the properties of p_+, p_- and α in the following lemma. Note that $\gamma > 0$ if and only if $\mathfrak{d} \neq 0$.

Lemma 4.6. *Assume that $\mathfrak{d} \neq 0$. Then*

$$p_\pm(x) < -\frac{1}{\gamma} \qquad \textit{for } x \in \mathscr{D}^*,$$

and hence

$$\alpha \leq -\frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

Proof. The assumption $\mathfrak{d} \neq 0$ implies that $\gamma > 0$. Let $x \in \mathscr{D}^*$. It follows from (4.1) that for $\lambda \in \big[-\frac{1}{\gamma}, \infty\big) \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] &= \lambda^2 \|x\|^2 + \lambda \mathfrak{d}[x] + \mathfrak{a}_0[x] \\ &\geq \lambda^2 \|x\|^2 - \frac{\mathfrak{d}[x]}{\gamma} + \mathfrak{a}_0[x] \geq \lambda^2 \|x\|^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathfrak{t}(0)[x] = \mathfrak{a}_0[x] > 0$, we therefore have $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] > 0$ for all $\lambda \in \left[-\frac{1}{\gamma}, \infty\right)$. This implies that $p_\pm(x) < -\frac{1}{\gamma}$. The statement on α follows from this and the inequality $-\frac{1}{\gamma_0} \leq -\frac{1}{\gamma}$. □

In the next proposition we discuss situations when the set $\mathscr{D}^*$ is empty or non-empty. Note that (i) in the following proposition contains a slight improvement of the fifth assertion in [13, Theorem 3.2].

Proposition 4.7. *For the set $\mathscr{D}^*$ we have the following implications.*

(i) *If*

$$A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} < 2A_0^{-1/2}, \tag{4.12}$$

where the inequality is understood as a relation between two self-adjoint operators in the Hilbert space H (i.e. $\langle A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} x, x\rangle < 2\langle A_0^{-1/2} x, x\rangle$ for all $x \in H \setminus \{0\}$), then

$$\mathscr{D}^* = \emptyset \qquad \text{and we have} \quad \sigma_p(\mathscr{A}) \cap \mathbb{R} = \emptyset.$$

(ii) *If*

$$\left\|A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2}\right\| > 2\left\|A_0^{-1/2}\right\|, \tag{4.13}$$

where the norms are the operator norm in the Hilbert space H, then

$$\mathscr{D}^* \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. (i) Let $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \{0\}$ be arbitrary and set $y := A_0^{1/2} x$. From the assumption (4.12) we obtain that

$$\left\langle A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} y, y\right\rangle < 2\left\langle A_0^{-1/2} y, y\right\rangle \leq 2\|y\| \left\|A_0^{-1/2} y\right\|,$$

which implies

$$\mathfrak{d}[x] = \langle Dx, x\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}} \times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} < 2\left\|A_0^{1/2} x\right\| \|x\| = 2\|x\| \sqrt{\mathfrak{a}_0[x]}.$$

Together with (4.10) this shows that $x \notin \mathscr{D}^*$. Hence $\mathscr{D}^* = \emptyset$. To prove the last statement in (i), let λ be a real eigenvalue of $\mathscr{A}$ with corresponding eigenvector $\binom{x}{y} \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A})$. Then

$$A_0 x + \lambda D x + \lambda^2 x = 0,$$

by (4.7), which implies that $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] = 0$. The latter is not possible since $\mathscr{D}^* = \emptyset$.

(ii) The number $\|A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2}\|$ is an element of the closure of the numerical range of the self-adjoint operator $A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2}$. Therefore, there exists a sequence (y_n) in H with $\|y_n\| = 1$ such that

$$\left\langle A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} y_n, y_n\right\rangle \to \left\|A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2}\right\| \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Assumption (4.13) implies that $\langle A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} y_{n_0}, y_{n_0}\rangle > 2\|A_0^{-1/2}\|$ for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $x := A_0^{-1/2} y_{n_0}$; then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}[x] = \langle Dx, x\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}} \times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} &= \left\langle A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} y_{n_0}, y_{n_0}\right\rangle > 2\left\|A_0^{-1/2}\right\| \\ &\geq 2\left\|A_0^{-1/2} y_{n_0}\right\| = 2\|x\| \left\|A_0^{1/2} x\right\| = 2\|x\| \sqrt{\mathfrak{a}_0[x]}.\end{aligned}$$

Now we obtain from (4.10) that $x \in \mathscr{D}^*$; hence $\mathscr{D}^* \neq \emptyset$. □

The following theorem is one of the main results of this paper. Recall that an eigenvalue is called semi-simple if the algebraic and geometric multiplicities coincide, i.e. if there are no Jordan chains.

Theorem 4.8. *Assume that* **(F1)–(F3)** *are satisfied. Let* Δ *be an interval with* $\Delta \subset (\alpha, 0]$ *and* $\max\Delta = 0$. *Then the set* $\sigma(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Delta$ *is either empty or consists only of a finite or infinite sequence of isolated semi-simple eigenvalues of finite multiplicity of* $\mathscr{A}$. *The case of infinitely many eigenvalues in* $\sigma(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Delta$ *can occur only if* $\alpha = -\frac{1}{\gamma_0} = \inf\Delta$ *and, in this case, the eigenvalues accumulate only at* $-\frac{1}{\gamma_0}$.

If $\sigma(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Delta$ *is empty, then set* $N := 0$*; otherwise, denote the eigenvalues of* $\mathscr{A}$ *in* Δ *by* $(\lambda_j)_{j=1}^N$, $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, *in non-increasing order, counted according to their multiplicities:* $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots$. *Then the nth eigenvalue* λ_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \leq N$, *satisfies*

$$\lambda_n = \max_{\substack{L \subset H_{1/2} \\ \dim L = n}} \min_{x \in L \setminus \{0\}} p_+(x) = \min_{\substack{L \subset H \\ \dim L = n-1}} \sup_{\substack{x \in H_{1/2} \setminus \{0\} \\ x \perp L}} p_+(x). \tag{4.14}$$

If $N < \infty$, *then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\substack{L \subset \mathscr{D} \\ \dim L = n}} \min_{x \in L \setminus \{0\}} p_+(x) \leq \inf\Delta \\ &\inf_{\substack{L \subset H \\ \dim L = n-1}} \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathscr{D} \setminus \{0\} \\ x \perp L}} p_+(x) \leq \inf\Delta \end{aligned} \qquad \text{for } n > N \text{ with } n \leq \dim H. \tag{4.15}$$

Proof. Except for the semi-simplicity, the first part of Theorem 4.8 follows from Proposition 3.5. Let us next prove the second part, for which we apply Theorem 2.6. To this end, we consider the operator function T defined on $\Omega := \Phi_{\gamma_0}$. Assumption (I) in Section 2 is satisfied because of Proposition 4.3 and because $T(0) = A_0$ is a positive definite operator in H. Next we show that $(\nearrow)$ is satisfied. For $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \{0\}$, the function $\lambda \mapsto \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]$ is increasing at value zero on Δ because it is convex and a zero in $(\alpha, 0]$ is the greater one of the two zeros of that function by the definition of α (note that a double-zero cannot lie in $(\alpha, 0]$). Hence $(\nearrow)$ is satisfied. Moreover, p_+ satisfies (2.2) in both cases $x \in \mathscr{D}^*$ and $x \notin \mathscr{D}^*$ by the definition of p_+. Therefore,

$$p(x) := p_+(x), \qquad x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}},$$

is a generalized Rayleigh functional for T on Δ, cf. Definition 2.1.

By Proposition 4.4 the eigenvalues and their geometric multiplicities of T and $\mathscr{A}$ coincide in Δ, and the interval Δ' in Theorem 2.6 equals now Δ. The quantity κ in Theorem 2.6 is determined as

$$\kappa = \dim \mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}\big(T(0)\big) = \dim \mathscr{L}_{(-\infty,0)}(A_0) = 0.$$

Now the formulae in (4.14) and in (4.15) follow from (2.11), (2.12), Remark 2.7 and Proposition 4.4.

Let us finally show that the eigenvalues of $\mathscr{A}$ in $(\alpha, 0)$ are semi-simple. Assume that $\lambda \in (\alpha, 0)$ is an eigenvalue that has a Jordan chain, i.e. there exist vectors $\binom{x_0}{y_0}$, $\binom{x_1}{y_1} \in \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{A})$, both being non-zero, such that

$$(\mathscr{A} - \lambda)\begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix} = 0, \qquad (\mathscr{A} - \lambda)\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ y_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.16}$$

It follows that $y_0 = \lambda x_0$ and $x_0 \neq 0$. Moreover, we have $x_0 \in \mathscr{D}(T(\lambda))$ and $T(\lambda)x_0 = 0$, cf. (4.7). From the second equation in (4.16) it follows that

$$y_1 = x_0 + \lambda x_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad A_0 x_1 + D y_1 + \lambda y_1 = -\lambda x_0.$$

Substituting for y_1 we obtain

$$-\big(\lambda^2 + \lambda D + A_0\big) x_1 = (2\lambda + D) x_0$$

and hence, by (4.3) and the symmetry of $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ for real λ,

$$\begin{aligned}\big\langle (2\lambda + D)x_0, x_0\big\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}}\times H_{\frac{1}{2}}} &= -\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x_1, x_0] = -\overline{\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x_0, x_1]} \\ &= -\overline{\big\langle T(\lambda)x_0, x_1\big\rangle_{H_{-\frac{1}{2}}\times H_{\frac{1}{2}}}} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $x_0 \in \ker T(\lambda)$. The left-hand side of this equation is equal to $\mathfrak{t}'(\lambda)[x_0]$, which is positive because $\lambda \in (\alpha, 0)$ and there is no double-zero of $\lambda \mapsto \mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x_0]$ in $(\alpha, 0]$. This is a contradiction and hence λ is semi-simple. □

The next proposition provides a sufficient condition for the existence of eigenvalues in the interval $\big(-\frac{1}{\gamma_0}, 0\big)$.

Proposition 4.9. *Assume that* **(F1)**–**(F3)** *are satisfied and that* $\gamma_0 > 0$. *If*

$$\sigma\Big(A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} - \frac{1}{\gamma_0} A_0^{-1}\Big) \cap (\gamma_0, \infty) \neq \emptyset, \tag{4.17}$$

then

$$\sigma(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Big(-\frac{1}{\gamma_0}, 0\Big) \neq \emptyset. \tag{4.18}$$

Proof. Define the following operator function

$$R(\lambda) := A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} + \lambda A_0^{-1} + \frac{1}{\lambda} I, \qquad \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\},$$

whose values are bounded operators in H. Assumption (4.17) implies that

$$\max \sigma\Big(R\Big(-\frac{1}{\gamma_0}\Big)\Big) = \max \sigma\Big(A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} - \frac{1}{\gamma_0} A_0^{-1} - \gamma_0 I\Big) > 0.$$

On the other hand, for $\lambda < 0$,

$$\max \sigma\big(R(\lambda)\big) \leq \gamma + \frac{1}{\lambda} \to -\infty \qquad \text{as } \lambda \to 0-.$$

Since $\max \sigma(R(\lambda))$ is continuous in λ (see, e.g. [15, Theorem V.4.10]), there exists a $\lambda_0 \in \big(-\frac{1}{\gamma_0}, 0\big)$ such that $\max \sigma(R(\lambda_0)) = 0$. The compactness of A_0^{-1} implies that

$$\max \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}\big(R(\lambda_0)\big) = \gamma_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_0} < 0.$$

Hence $0 \in \sigma_{\mathrm{p}}(R(\lambda_0))$, i.e. there exists a $y \in H \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} y + \lambda_0 A_0^{-1} y + \frac{1}{\lambda_0} y = 0.$$

Applying $A_0^{1/2}$ to both sides, multiplying by λ_0 and setting $x := A_0^{-1/2} y$ we obtain that

$$\lambda_0^2 x + \lambda_0 D x + A_0 x = 0.$$

This, together with (4.5), implies (4.18). □

The converse of Proposition 4.9 is not true, i.e. (4.18) does not imply (4.17). This can be seen from the following example. Let $H = \ell^2$ and define the operators A_0 and D by

$$(A_0 x)_n = n x_n, \qquad (Dx)_n = \begin{cases} 2x_1, & n = 1, \\ \dfrac{n}{2} x_n, & n \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

where $x = (x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$. Then $\gamma_0 = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\sigma\Big(A_0^{-1/2} D A_0^{-1/2} - \frac{1}{\gamma_0} A_0^{-1}\Big) = \Big\{0, \frac{1}{2}\Big\} \cup \Big\{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 2\Big\},$$

which is disjoint from (γ_0, ∞). However, -1 is an eigenvalue of T with eigenvector $(1, 0, 0, \dots)$.

With the help of the form $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)$ it is shown in the following proposition that a certain triangle belongs to the resolvent set of $\mathscr{A}$; see Figure 1. This complements [14, Theorem 3.2], where it was shown that the open disc around zero with radius

$$r = \frac{2}{\gamma + \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4\|A_0^{-1}\|}},$$

belongs to $\rho(\mathscr{A})$; note that $r < \frac{1}{\gamma}$.



Figure 1: The region on the left-hand side of (4.19), which is contained in $\rho(\mathscr{A})$; the three circles indicate the numbers $-\frac{1}{\gamma}$, $-\frac{1}{\gamma} \pm \frac{i}{\gamma}$, which, in general, do not belong to $\rho(\mathscr{A})$.

Proposition 4.10. *Assume that* $\mathfrak{d} \neq 0$. *Then*

$$\left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} \;\middle|\; z = 0 \text{ or } -\frac{1}{\gamma} \leq \operatorname{Re} z < 0, \arg z \in \left[\frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{5\pi}{4}\right] \right\} \setminus \left\{ -\frac{1}{\gamma}, -\frac{1}{\gamma} \pm \frac{i}{\gamma} \right\} \subset \rho(\mathscr{A}) \tag{4.19}$$

where γ *is defined in* (3.16). *If, in addition,* $\gamma \neq \gamma_0$, *then also* $-\frac{1}{\gamma} \in \rho(\mathscr{A})$.

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{d} \neq 0$, we have $D \neq 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, see (3.16). Let λ be either in the set on the left-hand side of (4.19) or let $\lambda = -\frac{1}{\gamma}$ and assume that $\gamma \neq \gamma_0$ in the latter case. Suppose that $\lambda \in \sigma(\mathscr{A})$. By Proposition 3.5 the set on the left-hand side of (4.19) is disjoint from $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A})$, and $-\frac{1}{\gamma} \notin \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A})$ if $\gamma \neq \gamma_0$. Hence λ

is an eigenvalue of $\mathscr{A}$. By (4.7) there exists an $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] = 0$. We have $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \geq -\frac{1}{\gamma}$ and $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda^2) \geq 0$, where at least one of the two inequalities is strict. Using (4.1) we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \operatorname{Re}\big(\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x]\big) &= \operatorname{Re}(\lambda^2)\|x\|^2 + (\operatorname{Re}\lambda)\mathfrak{d}[x] + \mathfrak{a}_0[x] \\ &\geq \operatorname{Re}(\lambda^2)\|x\|^2 + (\operatorname{Re}\lambda)\gamma\mathfrak{a}_0[x] + \mathfrak{a}_0[x] \\ &> -\frac{1}{\gamma}\cdot\gamma\mathfrak{a}_0[x] + \mathfrak{a}_0[x] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence $\lambda \in \rho(\mathscr{A})$. □

One can easily construct examples with eigenvalues λ of $\mathscr{A}$ satisfying $\arg\lambda \in \big(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{4}\big)$ and $|\operatorname{Re}\lambda| < \frac{1}{\gamma}$. For example, let A_0 be a positive definite operator with compact resolvent and smallest eigenvalue $1/2$. For the choice $D = A_0$, we have $\gamma = 1$ and $\lambda_0 = -\frac{1}{4} + i\frac{\sqrt{7}}{4}$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathscr{A}$ which satisfies $\operatorname{Re}\lambda_0 = -1/4 > -\frac{1}{\gamma} = -1$ and $\arg\lambda_0 \in \big(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{4}\big)$.

Another application of Theorem 4.8 results in interlacing properties of eigenvalues of two different second-order problems with coefficients that satisfy a specific order relation. This is the content of the following theorem.

Theorem 4.11. *Let the forms $\mathfrak{a}_0$, $\hat{\mathfrak{a}}_0$, $\mathfrak{d}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{d}}$ in the Hilbert space H be given so that $\mathfrak{a}_0$, $\mathfrak{d}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{a}}_0$, $\hat{\mathfrak{d}}$, respectively, satisfy assumptions* **(F1)–(F3)**. *Assume that $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0) = \mathscr{D}(\hat{\mathfrak{a}}_0)$ and*

$$\mathfrak{a}_0[x] \geq \hat{\mathfrak{a}}_0[x], \qquad \mathfrak{d}[x] \leq \hat{\mathfrak{d}}[x] \qquad \text{for } x \in \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0). \tag{4.20}$$

Let $\hat{\mathscr{A}}$, $\hat{\delta}$, $\hat{\gamma}$, $\hat{\delta}_0$, $\hat{\gamma}_0$, $\hat{\mathfrak{t}}$, $\hat{p}_\pm$, and $\hat{\alpha}$ be defined as in (3.10)–(3.11), (3.16), (3.17), (3.18), (4.3), *and* (4.9)–(4.11), *respectively, where $\mathfrak{a}_0$ is replaced by $\hat{\mathfrak{a}}_0$ and $\mathfrak{d}$ by $\hat{\mathfrak{d}}$. Then we have*

$$\gamma \leq \hat{\gamma}, \qquad \gamma_0 \leq \hat{\gamma}_0, \qquad \delta \leq \hat{\delta}, \qquad \delta_0 \leq \hat{\delta}_0. \tag{4.21}$$

Let

$$\Delta := (a, 0] \qquad \text{with} \quad a \geq \max\{\alpha, \hat{\alpha}\}.$$

Assume now that $\sigma(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Delta$ is non-empty; then also $\sigma(\hat{\mathscr{A}}) \cap \Delta$ is non-empty. Let $(\lambda_n)_{n=1}^N$ and $(\hat{\lambda}_n)_{n=1}^{\hat{N}}$, $N, \hat{N} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, be the eigenvalues of $\mathscr{A}$ and $\hat{\mathscr{A}}$, respectively, in the interval Δ, both arranged in non-increasing order and counted according their multiplicities. Then $N \leq \hat{N}$ and

$$\lambda_n \leq \hat{\lambda}_n \qquad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}, n \leq N. \tag{4.22}$$

Proof. The inequalities in (4.21) follow from (4.20), (3.20), (3.21), (3.22) and (3.17), e.g.

$$\gamma = \sup_{y \in H_{1/2}\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\mathfrak{d}[y]}{\mathfrak{a}_0[y]} \leq \sup_{y \in H_{1/2}\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\hat{\mathfrak{d}}[y]}{\hat{\mathfrak{a}}_0[y]} = \hat{\gamma}.$$

The relations in (4.20) imply that

$$\mathfrak{t}(\lambda)[x] \geq \hat{\mathfrak{t}}(\lambda)[x], \qquad x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}},\ \lambda \in (-\infty, 0].$$

It follows from (2.4) that $p_+(x) \leq \hat{p}_+(x)$ for $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \{0\}$ and hence

$$\mu_n := \sup_{\substack{L \subset H_{1/2} \\ \dim L = n}} \min_{x \in L\setminus\{0\}} p_+(x) \leq \sup_{\substack{L \subset H_{1/2} \\ \dim L = n}} \min_{x \in L\setminus\{0\}} \hat{p}_+(x) =: \hat{\mu}_n. \tag{4.23}$$

Assume that $\mathscr{A}$ has at least m eigenvalues in Δ. Then, by Theorem 4.8, $\lambda_m = \mu_m > a$. If $\hat{\mathscr{A}}$ had less than $m-1$ eigenvalues in Δ, then $\hat{\mu}_m \leq a$ by (4.15), which is a contradiction to (4.23). Hence the implication $\sigma(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset \ \Rightarrow\ \sigma(\hat{\mathscr{A}}) \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset$ and the inequality $N \leq \hat{N}$ are true. Finally, the inequality in (4.22) follows from (4.14) and (4.23). □

5 Example: beam with damping

We consider a beam of length 1 and study transverse vibrations only. Let $u(r,t)$ denote the deflection of the beam from its rigid body motion at time t and position r. We consider for the beam deflection a damping model which leads to the following description of the vibrations where $a_0 > 0$ is a real constant and $d \in C^1[0,1]$ with $\min_{r\in[0,1]} d(r) > 0$:

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} + a_0 \frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial r^4} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t \partial r}\left[d \frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right] = 0, \qquad r \in (0,1), t > 0. \tag{5.1}$$

Assuming that the beam is pinned, free to rotate and does not experience any torque at both ends, we have for all $t > 0$ the following boundary conditions

$$u\big|_{r=0} = u\big|_{r=1} = \left.\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial r^2}\right|_{r=0} = \left.\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial r^2}\right|_{r=1} = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

We consider the partial differential equation (5.1)–(5.2) as a second-order problem in the Hilbert space $H = L^2(0,1)$. In order to formulate this beam equation as in (3.1), we introduce the forms $\mathfrak{a}_0$ and $\mathfrak{d}$ defined for x, y from the form domains $\mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0) = \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{d}) = H^2(0,1) \cap H_0^1(0,1)$ as

$$\mathfrak{a}_0[x,y] := a_0 \int_0^1 x''(r)\overline{y''(r)}\mathrm{d}r \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathfrak{d}[x,y] := \int_0^1 d(r)x'(r)\overline{y'(r)}\mathrm{d}r.$$

Then (5.1)–(5.2) corresponds to

$$\langle \ddot{u}(t), y\rangle + \mathfrak{a}_0[u(t),y] + \mathfrak{d}[\dot{u}(t),y] = 0 \qquad \text{for all } y \in \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0) = \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{d}).$$

Set

$$d_{\min} := \min_{r\in[0,1]} d(r), \qquad d_{\max} := \max_{r\in[0,1]} d(r).$$

For $x \in \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$ we have

$$\mathfrak{a}_0[x] = a_0\langle x'', x''\rangle \geq a_0\pi^4\|x\|^2,$$

which shows **(F1)**. Using again $\|x''\| \geq \pi^2\|x\|$ we obtain for $x \in \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{a}_0[x] = a_0\|x''\|^2 &\geq a_0\pi^2\|x''\|\|x\| \geq a_0\pi^2\left|\int_0^1 x''(r)\overline{x(r)}\mathrm{d}r\right| \\ &= a_0\pi^2\int_0^1 \left|x'(r)\right|^2\mathrm{d}r \geq \frac{a_0\pi^2}{d_{\max}}\int_0^1 d(r)\left|x'(r)\right|^2\mathrm{d}r = \frac{a_0\pi^2}{d_{\max}}\mathfrak{d}[x].\end{aligned}$$

Thus **(F2)** holds. In order to show **(F3)** we introduce the operator A_0 associated with $\mathfrak{a}_0$ via the the First Representation Theorem [15, Theorem VI.2.1] as in (3.2). It is easy to see that A_0 has the form

$$A_0 = a_0\frac{\mathrm{d}^4}{\mathrm{d}r^4}, \quad \mathscr{D}(A_0) = \left\{z \in \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0) \mid z'' \in \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0)\right\}.$$

Obviously, A_0 satisfies assumption **(F3)**. We define the Hilbert space $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ as in (3.3); then $H_{\frac{1}{2}} = \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{a}_0) = \mathscr{D}(\mathfrak{d})$. Moreover, we define the damping operator as

$$D := -\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\left[d\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\right].$$

Due to the fact that $d \in C^1[0,1]$, D is a linear bounded operator from $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ to H. For $x \in H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ we have

$$\langle Dx, x\rangle = \langle dx', x'\rangle = \mathfrak{d}[x].$$

Since $DA_0^{-1/2}$ is a bounded operator in H and $A_0^{-1/2}$ is a compact operator in H, we see that $A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}$ is a compact operator in H. From this we obtain

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}\big(A_0^{-1/2}DA_0^{-1/2}\big) = \{0\}$$

and hence $\gamma_0 = \delta_0 = 0$. This, together with Proposition 3.5, yields

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A}) = \emptyset. \tag{5.3}$$

Finally, we apply the results of this paper to the damped beam equation.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that*

$$d_{\min}^2 \geq 4a_0. \tag{5.4}$$

Then $\mathscr{D}^* \neq \emptyset$ (*cf.* (4.10)) *and the number* α *from* (4.11) *satisfies* $\alpha \leq -d_{\min}\frac{\pi^2}{2}$. *The set*

$$\sigma(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Big(-\frac{d_{\min}\pi^2}{2}, 0\Big)$$

is non-empty and consists only of a finite sequence of isolated semi-simple eigenvalues of finite multiplicity of $\mathscr{A}$ *counted according to their multiplicities:* $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_N$ *for some* $N \in \mathbb{N}$. *The nth eigenvalue* λ_n, $1 \leq n \leq N$, *satisfies* (4.14) *in Theorem* 4.8 *and the following inequalities:*

$$\lambda_n \leq \frac{-d_{\max} + \sqrt{d_{\max}^2 - 4a_0}}{2} \cdot \pi^2 n^2, \qquad 1 \leq n \leq N, \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$\lambda_n \geq \frac{-d_{\min} + \sqrt{d_{\min}^2 - 4a_0}}{2} \cdot \pi^2 n^2, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } n^2 \leq \frac{1}{1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{4a_0}{d_{\min}^2}}}. \tag{5.6}$$

Note that the inequality in (5.6) for λ_n holds at least for $n = 1$.

Proof. We introduce the forms $\mathfrak{d}_{\min}$ and $\mathfrak{d}_{\max}$ by

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\min/\max}[x,y] := d_{\min/\max}\int_0^1 x'(r)\overline{y'(r)}\mathrm{d}r, \qquad x,y \in H_{\frac{1}{2}},$$

the form polynomials $\mathfrak{t}_{\min}$ and $\mathfrak{t}_{\max}$ by

$$\mathfrak{t}_{\min/\max}(\lambda)[x,y] := \lambda^2\langle x,y\rangle + \lambda\,\mathfrak{d}_{\min/\max}[x,y] + \mathfrak{a}_0[x,y], \qquad x,y \in H_{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and the corresponding operator functions $T_{\min}$ and $T_{\max}$ as in Proposition 4.3. Let $S := -\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}r^2}$ in $L^2(0,1)$ with domain $\mathscr{D}(S) = H^2(0,1) \cap H_0^1(0,1)$, which has spectrum $\sigma(S) = \{n^2\pi^2 \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Since we can write

$$T_{\min/\max}(\lambda) = \lambda^2 + \lambda\, d_{\min/\max}S + a_0S^2,$$

we can use the spectral mapping theorem to obtain

$$\sigma(T_{\min}) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \lambda^2 + \lambda d_{\min} n^2\pi^2 + a_0 n^4\pi^4 = 0 \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$
$$= \left\{ \frac{-d_{\min} \pm \sqrt{d_{\min}^2 - 4a_0}}{2} \cdot n^2\pi^2 \,\middle|\, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \subset (-\infty, 0). \tag{5.7}$$

In a similar way one obtains a description of $\sigma(T_{\max})$.

Define $p_\pm$, $p_\pm^{(\min)}$, $p_\pm^{(\max)}$, $\mathscr{D}^*$, $\mathscr{D}_{\min}^*$, $\mathscr{D}_{\max}^*$, α, $\alpha_{\min}$, $\alpha_{\max}$ as in Definition 4.5 corresponding to T, $T_{\min}$ and $T_{\max}$, respectively. Denote by e_1 the eigenvector to the smallest eigenvalue, π^2, of S with $\|e_1\| = 1$, i.e. $e_1 = \sqrt{2}\sin(\pi\,\cdot)$ and $Se_1 = \pi^2 e_1$. It follows from (5.4) that

$$\mathfrak{d}[e_1] - 2\|e_1\|\sqrt{\mathfrak{a}_0[e_1]} \geq \mathfrak{d}_{\min}[e_1] - 2\sqrt{\mathfrak{a}_0[e_1]}$$
$$= d_{\min}\langle Se_1, e_1\rangle - 2\sqrt{a_0}\|Se_1\| = d_{\min}\pi^2 - 2\sqrt{a_0}\pi^2 \geq 0,$$

which by (4.10) implies that $\mathscr{D}^* \neq \emptyset$. Since $\gamma_0 = 0$, we have

$$\alpha = \sup_{x\in\mathscr{D}^*} p_-(x) = \sup_{x\in\mathscr{D}^*} \frac{-\mathfrak{d}[x] - \sqrt{\big(\mathfrak{d}[x]\big)^2 - 4\|x\|^2\mathfrak{a}_0[x]}}{2\|x\|^2}$$
$$\leq \sup_{x\in\mathscr{D}^*} \frac{-\mathfrak{d}[x]}{2\|x\|^2} \leq \sup_{x\in H_{1/2}} \frac{-\mathfrak{d}_{\min}[x]}{2\|x\|^2} = -\inf_{x\in H_{1/2}} \frac{d_{\min}\|x'\|^2}{2\|x\|^2} = -\frac{d_{\min}\pi^2}{2}.$$

In the same way one obtains that $\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max} \leq -\frac{d_{\min}\pi^2}{2}$.

Set $\Delta := \big(-\frac{d_{\min}\pi^2}{2}, 0\big]$ and let $(\lambda_n^{(\min)})_{n=1}^{N_{\min}}$ and $(\lambda_n^{(\max)})_{n=1}^{N_{\max}}$ be the eigenvalues of $T_{\min}$ and $T_{\max}$, respectively, in the interval Δ ordered non-increasingly and counted with multiplicities. We can apply Theorem 4.11 to the pairs $T_{\min}$, T and T, $T_{\max}$, which implies that $N_{\min} \leq N \leq N_{\max}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_n^{(\min)} &\leq \lambda_n, \qquad & 1 \leq n \leq N_{\min}, \\ \lambda_n &\leq \lambda_n^{(\max)}, \qquad & 1 \leq n \leq N. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

It follows from (5.7) that

$$\lambda_n^{(\min)} = \frac{-d_{\min} + \sqrt{d_{\min}^2 - 4a_0}}{2} \cdot n^2\pi^2, \qquad \lambda_n^{(\max)} = \frac{-d_{\max} + \sqrt{d_{\max}^2 - 4a_0}}{2} \cdot n^2\pi^2.$$

Moreover, $N_{\min}$ is the largest positive integer such that

$$\frac{-d_{\min} + \sqrt{d_{\min}^2 - 4a_0}}{2} \cdot N_{\min}^2\pi^2 \geq -\frac{d_{\min}\pi^2}{2},$$

where the latter inequality is equivalent to

$$N_{\min}^2 \leq \frac{d_{\min}}{d_{\min} - \sqrt{d_{\min}^2 - 4a_0}} = \frac{1}{1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{4a_0}{d_{\min}^2}}}. \tag{5.9}$$

Now the inequalities in (5.8) imply (5.5) and (5.6). Since the right-hand side of (5.9) is greater than or equal to 1, we have $N \geq N_{\min} \geq 1$. Hence $\sigma(\mathscr{A}) \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, N is finite because $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mathscr{A}) = \emptyset$. □

Acknowledgements

Finally, the authors like to thank the anonymous referee for suggestions that improved the exposition of the paper.

References

[1] T. YA. AZIZOV AND I. S. IOKHVIDOV, *Linear Operators in Spaces with an Indefinite Metric*, John Wiley & Sons, 1989.

[2] H. T. BANKS AND K. ITO, A unified framework for approximation in inverse problems for distributed parameter systems, *Control Theory and Adv. Tech.* **4** (1988), 73–90.

[3] H. T. BANKS, K. ITO AND Y. WANG, Well posedness for damped second order systems with unbounded input operators, *Differential Integral Equations* **8** (1995), 587–606.

[4] P. BINDING, D. ESCHWÉ AND H. LANGER, Variational principles for real eigenvalues of self-adjoint operator pencils, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* **38** (2000), 190–206.

[5] J. BOGNAR, *Indefinite Inner Product Spaces*, Springer, 1974.

[6] S. CHEN, K. LIU AND Z. LIU, Spectrum and stability for elastic systems with global or local Kelvin–Voigt damping, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **59** (1998), 651–668.

[7] R. J. DUFFIN, A minimax theory for overdamped networks, *J. Rational Mech. Anal.* **4** (1955), 221–233.

[8] D. E. EDMUNDS AND W. D. EVANS, *Spectral Theory and Differential Operators*, Oxford University Press, 1987.

[9] D. ESCHWÉ AND M. LANGER, Variational principles for eigenvalues of self-adjoint operator functions, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* **49** (2004), 287–321.

[10] R. O. HRYNIV AND A. A. SHKALIKOV, Exponential stability of semigroups related to operator models in mechanics, *Math. Notes* **73** (2003), 657–664.

[11] B. JACOB, K. MORRIS AND C. TRUNK, Minimum-phase infinite-dimensional second-order systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **52** (2007), 1654–1665.

[12] B. JACOB AND C. TRUNK, Location of the spectrum of operator matrices which are associated to second order equations, *Oper. Matrices* **1** (2007), 45–60.

[13] B. JACOB AND C. TRUNK, Spectrum and analyticity of semigroups arising in elasticity theory and hydromechanics, *Semigroup Forum* **79** (2009), 79–100.

[14] B. JACOB, C. TRUNK AND M. WINKLMEIER, Analyticity and Riesz basis property of semigroups associated to damped vibrations, *J. Evol. Equ.* **8** (2008), 263–281.

[15] T. KATO, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Second Edition, Springer, 1976.

[16] I. LASIECKA, Stabilization of wave and plate equations with nonlinear dissipation on the boundary, *J. Differential Equations* **79** (1989), 340–381.

[17] C. TRUNK, Spectral theory for operator matrices related to models in mechanics, *Math. Notes* **83** (2008), 843–850.

[18] M. TUCSNAK AND G. WEISS, How to get a conservative well-posed system out of thin air, Part II, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **42** (2003), 907–935.

[19] H. Voss, Variational principles for eigenvalues of nonlinear eigenproblems, in: *Numerical Mathematics and Advanced Applications – ENUMATH 2013*, Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering, vol. 103 (2015), 305–313.

[20] A. WEINSTEIN AND W. STENGER, Methods of Intermediate Problems for Eigenvalues, Academic Press, 1972.

[21] G. WEISS AND M. TUCSNAK, How to get a conservative well-posed system out of thin air, Part I, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* **9** (2003), 247–274.